

FINAL
BLOOMFIELD TOWN COUNCIL

There was a regular meeting of the Bloomfield Town Council held at 7:30 p.m. on Monday, February 22, 2016 in Council Chambers, Bloomfield Town Hall, 800 Bloomfield Avenue, Bloomfield, CT.

Present were: Mayor Joan Gamble, Councilors Wayne Hypolite, Derrick Seldon, Patrick DeLorenzo, Joseph Merritt, Leon Rivers and Joseph Washington

Also present were: Philip K. Schenck, Jr., Town Manager, Sharron Howe, Assistant to the Town Manager and India M. Rodgers, Clerk of Council

Absent was: Deputy Mayor Sydney Schulman and Councilor Neuwirth

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting began with the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing opened at 7:35 p.m.

1. **Kevin Gough, 5 Bear Ridge Drive**, inquired about the building permit fee for Niagara Bottling in the amount of \$450,000. It was explained that \$395,000 was collected for the foundation/shell. The remaining amount will be collected at a later date as a separate permit for the actual interior contents within the building.

The public hearing closed at 7:40 p.m.

ANNOUCEMENTS & PRESENTATIONS

Conservation, Energy and Environment Committee (CEEC) – Home Energy Solutions – Check Presentation – Bloomfield Fuel Bank

Mrs. Marie MacDonald, Chair of the Conservation, Energy and Environment Committee presented a check in the amount of \$2775.00 for the Bloomfield Fuel Bank. The Home Energy Solutions Program endorsed by Victory Solutions and New England Conservation Services provide energy efficiency measures for residents in town.

The Town of Bloomfield is one of four communities in the state to have earned three “Bright Idea” grants of \$10,000 each. In addition, the town is one of twenty towns in the State of Connecticut to offer a light bulb swap.

On Saturday, April 16, 2016 the CEEC will sponsor a “Light Bulb Swap” for residents to receive a maximum of five new LED bulbs for old incandescent bulbs.

Black History Month Presentation: Mr. John Loban

Mr. John Loban was one of the “Syracuse 8” football players who boycotted the 1970 football season in a collective effort to demand change and promote racial equality within the University football program. These student-athletes wanted better medical care for injured players and stronger academic support for African American student-athletes; the right to compete fairly for any position on the starting team; and racial integration of the football coaching staff.

Prosser Library Building Committee

Mr. Mark Weisman, Chair of the Prosser Library Building Committee presented an update of the Prosser Library Building Committee charges, planning phase objectives and potential site locations. (see attached status update letter)

Mr. Richard Szczypek, Architect from Tai Soo Kim Partners of Hartford gave a brief update regarding the scope of library needs and outlook the potential location sites.

Dr. Don Poland of Goman & York Consultants commented on the relation of this project to Economic Development as civic institution and a part of the town center. In addition, they will also provide assistance with real estate development and other town economic development objectives such as: tax increment financing.

Councilor DeLorenzo inquired about the amount of the State of Connecticut grant program for libraries. The maximum grant amount is \$1,000,000.

Councilor Merritt mentioned that all meetings of this committee are open to the public. The committee have scheduled meetings every two weeks.

Councilor Hypolite stated that he was pleased to know there is consideration in exploring the relocation of Prosser Library to the 330 Park Avenue site.

Councilor Seldon requested additional information regarding the four locations being considered with multiple options for each.

Councilor Washington inquired about leasing space at Wintonbury Mall for the library. It was noted that is estimated to cost approximately \$10,000,000 - \$12,000,000 to build a new site.

CITIZEN STATEMENTS & PETITIONS

Councilor Hypolite commented on an outline and a course of action to address concerns raised by town residents regarding process, transparency and public input. It will incorporate a comprehensive discussion regarding Economic Development and tax incentives. Meanwhile, the town should consider pivoting efforts to State of Connecticut, who has considerable leverage in passing laws and regulations for exemption on a statewide basis regarding of public water and the environmental impact.

Mayor Gamble explained that the only action taken by Council was the approval of a tax abatement. It was determined that the Council would consider a new process for future negotiations with businesses interested in coming to Bloomfield:

- 1. Create an expanded e-mail list of the Town Council agenda to those residents who request to be added to a circulation list.**
- 2. Automatically e-mail Council agendas to the Chairs of all Boards, Commissions and Advisory Committees.**
- 3. All applications for tax abatements will be advertised in the newspaper, subject to public discussion in Council Chambers.**
- 4. Request all town applications for zoning, wetlands and tax abatements be amended to require disclosure of any developer of the project, to be amended by the applicant through the date of approval.**
- 5. Request to the MDC that all of their agendas and minutes be sent to the Town Manager for distribution to Council. These will become public records and available to the public**
- 6. Council will require quarterly reports from the MDC representative who will be placed on Council agenda. An immediate notification of any issues involving local impacts to residents or businesses.**
- 7. Matters involving environmental impact will be referred to the Environmental advisory committee for review and comment.**
- 8. Request a meeting with the Finance and Administration/Education subcommittees in conjunction with the Land Use & Economic Development subcommittee study and work with staff to make recommendations for reviewing and considering requests for municipal tax abatements.**

Effective October 1, 2015, the State of Connecticut Legislature passed a new law regarding Tax Increment Financing. Tax increment financing (TIF) is a public financing method that is used to incentivize and catalyze development, infrastructure, and other projects. Essentially, it allocates the future property tax revenues from a project or project area - that are above and beyond what

would have been generated without project – to costs associated with the project. The property tax benefits from the project are used to help with financing.

Mayor Gamble proposed to meet with five representatives from bloomfieldcitizens.org in a public location in Town Hall with another Councilor with those who are interested in further discussions regarding transparency and process.

1. **Guthrie Sayen, 27 Rundelane** spoke regarding the breakdown of the democratic process, refusal to acknowledge harms, precious resource is water, no environmental study, no traffic study, no cost benefit analysis, not economic development – it's corporate welfare. (see attached letter)
2. **Valerie Rossetti, 88 Kenmore Road**, recommended a 10 point plan to protect the water and democracy as well as the proposed legislation drafted by State Representative David Baram (see attached outline).
3. **Carmela Garofalo, 10 Westbrook Court**, expressed dismay regarding the level of pollution that this plant will produce. She also commented on exploring the option to breach the contract with Niagara, rather than polluting the planet even more.
4. **Margo Henneback 13 Pent Road**, expressed concerns and referenced the "Bay of Pigs" - "Groupthink" theories of the Town Council, in which they were irrational in their [decision-making](#) outcomes when deciding to bring Niagara to town.
5. **Mark Shapiro, 8 Hampton Lane**, read a response from resident Bradley Klein, 82 Tariffville Road, referencing the public golf course process in comparison to Niagara Bottling, designation between ethics and law.
6. **Sharon Mann, 1 Adams Road**, read an outline of communications via e-mail and public record regarding the correspondence between the town and Niagara Bottling. (see comment letter attached)
7. **Tollie Miller, 88 Kenmore Road**, expressed her discontentment with the lack of democratic process, turning a blind eye to constituents and the overall damaging impact of plastics on the environment.
8. **Mark Saunders, 13 Pent Road**, commented on the validity of this project and expressed concerns of an open process.
9. **Kevin Gough, 5 Bear Ridge Drive**, presented a cost benefit analysis with updated figures regarding the tax abatement for the Niagara project. (see attached)
10. **Paula Jones, 5 Bear Ridge Drive**, read a portion of e-mail correspondence regarding the tax abatement agreement with Niagara and the town. In additional e-mail

correspondence, several other towns were listed regarding tax incentives and jobs offered. (see attached)

11. **Connie Clifford, 162 School Street**, informed residents of her recent inquiry at Geissler's Supermarket regarding the sale of Niagara water products.
12. **Lori Brown**, spoke about new legislative initiatives, outlaw discounts for large users, discount for sewage waste, added surcharges and the requirement of complete level of transparency. (see attached)
13. **Jane Nodel-Klein, 82 Tariffville Road**, read an e-mail exchange between Mayor Gamble and Senator Beth Bye.
14. **Ayse Ozkaya, 56 Filley Street** – reiterated the importance of water as a precious resource. She also expressed concerns with hidden information for the local delegation and the effect on local agriculture.
15. **Susan Yurasevecz, 52 Filley Street** – expressed dismay and disappointment with the lack of transparency for this project.
16. **Al Taylor, 15 Regency Drive** – former MDC Commissioner commented on the factual information regarding water usage, availability and the sale of water to various business entities.
17. **Robin Sherwood, 14 Duncaster Road** – reiterated the vision for Bloomfield and expressed concerns about the town center.
18. **Mary Pelletier, Parkwatershed.org (501c3), Hartford resident** - stated the importance of preserving clean water as a resource and the negative implications of the Niagara Bottling project.
19. **Lucy Anne Hurston, 5 Christine Circle**, expressed discontentment in the entire process, lack of transparency, public trust and the abuse of powers as a representative body.

REPORT FROM COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEES

Community Services – The next meeting of this subcommittee will be held on March 1, 2016 at 6:00 p.m.

Administration & Education – The next meeting of this subcommittee will be held on March 7, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.

Committee on Committees – This subcommittee report will be deferred for discussion under Council business.

Julius Albert Clark, Jr. 337 Rockwell Avenue

Toni Clark	337 Rockwell Avenue
Sylvester Agbonta Esangbedo	17 Applewood Road
Elizabeth R. Landell-Simon	9 Prospect Street
Heroline T. Lee-Standberry	131 Woodland Avenue
Jane Low	20 Prospect Street
Anne E. Wall	6 Marguerite Avenue

FY 15/16-53: Consider and Take Action Regarding Reappointment to the Board of Assessment Appeals

It was moved by Councilor Washington, seconded by Councilor Rivers and voted unanimously to reappoint the following individuals to the Board of Assessment Appeals:

Harriette S. Howard	7 Spice Bush Lane
Quentin Johnson	85 Woodland Avenue
William Ortiz	3 Hampton Lane

FY 15/16-54: Consider and Take Action Regarding Disbanding Old Building Committees

Mayor Joan Gamble officially disbanded the following building committees:

High School Building Committee

Carmen Arace Building Committee

Elementary School Building Committee

FY 15/16-55: Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Allocating \$5,000 for the Filley Pond Committee for Advertising Expenses

This item was referred to the next scheduled Administration & Education Subcommittee scheduled for Monday, March 7, 2016 at 6:00 p.m.

Mayor's Report

No report at this time.

Town Manager's Report

Mr. Schenck, Jr., Town Manager reported the following updates to the Town Council:

Mr. Schenck, Jr. and representatives from Goman & York visited the following local businesses this month:

- CIGNA
- Absolute Machine Company
- Kohler-Lea
- S & S Centerless Grinding

The FY 2016/2017 Town Budget is fast approaching. On Thursday, March 10, 2016, the Board of Education and Town Budget Overview/Presentation will be presented. A Public Hearing for the town budget is scheduled for Tuesday, March 22, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Councilor Washington, seconded by Councilor Rivers to approve the minutes of January 25, 2016 with an amendment and noted corrections.

VOTE: AYE: J. Gamble, S. Schulman, J. Washington, W. Hypolite, L. Rivers, J. Neuwirth, P. DeLorenzo, D. Seldon
NAY: None
ABSTAIN: J. Merritt

The motion passes: 8-0-1

COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilor Merritt reiterated the importance of concerns and comments made by the public. In addition, the Council is committed to future discussions regarding policy changes with tax incentives for businesses.

Councilor Washington wished Mrs. Harriette Howard a Happy Birthday. He also mentioned the excellent response of two officers that was called to his home. He will recognize them at the March meeting. Councilor Washington also contributed a Black History fact of Mrs. Shirley Chisholm. In 1968, she became the first African American woman elected to the United States Congress, and represented New York's 12th Congressional District for seven terms from 1969 to 1983. In 1972, she became the first major-party black candidate for President of the United States, and the first woman ever to run for the Democratic Party's presidential nomination.

Councilor Hypolite thanked Mayor Gamble for scheduling a meeting with residents for further discussions. He also commended both the Council and CEEC for their effort in recommending a 10-point plan for improved democracy and transparency. The Finance subcommittee will continue to establish tax abatement principles. Councilor Hypolite commended Councilor Rivers on his efforts to have recognition for Black History month.

Councilor Rivers recognized Bloomfield High School on their academic excellence as well as their athletics. The Girls Track team won their 7th consecutive championship and the Boys Track team won their 4th championship.

Councilor Seldon commented on the proposed legislative changes regarding transparency. He reiterated the Council's initial decision regarding Niagara, in which Council voted to bring new jobs, tax revenue and improve economic growth to town. He thanked all of the residents for their advocacy.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 11:06 p.m., it was moved by Councilor Washington, seconded by Councilor Seldon and voted unanimously to enter into Executive Session A. – Discussion Concerning Resolution of Pending Litigation with the Town Council, Town Manager, Assistant to the Town Manager, Town Engineer and Attorney Emily Holland.

At 11:19 p.m., it was moved by Councilor Merritt, seconded by Councilor Washington and voted unanimously to exit Executive Session A and enter into regular session.

At 11:20 p.m., Council Item FY 15/16-56: Consider and Take Action Regarding Resolution of Pending Litigation was moved by Councilor Merritt, seconded by Councilor DeLorenzo and voted unanimously to authorize the attorney to enter into settlement with JMS Newberry, pending approval of language by Attorney Marc Needelman.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11:22 p.m., it was moved by Councilor Merritt, seconded by Councilor DeLorenzo and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

FEBRUARY 2016 REFUNDS		
BIGELOW KATHRYN GRACE	2014MV	\$136.98
CAIN FERDINAND E JR	2013MV	\$20.76
CENAXO LLC	2014MV	\$59.18
CORELOGIC	2014RE	\$2,783.52
FINANCIAL SER VEH	2014MVS	\$843.58
FORBES MARS	2014MV	\$8.93
HONDA LEASE TRUST	2014MV	\$97.32
DORSETT TERRY OR KAREN	2014MV	\$6.88
HYUNDAI LEASE	2013MV	\$1,476.49
	2014MV	\$846.53
KNOWLEN ROYCE 11 WOODFORD DR	2014RE	\$500.00
LE TUAN	2014MV	\$16.11
LERETA DOUBLE PAYMENT 127 E HAROLD ST	2014RE	\$1,324.80
MAYBIN SHELBY OR LAURENCE	2013MV	\$94.62
OSZAPINSKI FRANK JR	2014MV	\$157.78
OTIS ELEVATOR 212 WEST NEWBERRY RD	2014RE	\$3,741.82
PALMER WILLIAM OR ELEANOR	2014MV	\$239.14
PDS ENGINEER	2014MV	\$105.64
PINNOCK ANDREW	2013MV	\$44.74
WESTON ANTHONY	2014MV	\$119.57
		<u>\$12,624.39</u>

Prosser Library Alteration/Construction Building Committee

Report to Town Council

February 22, 2016

Committee Members:

Mark Weisman, Chair

Vera Smith-Winfrey, Vice Chair

Gail Nolan, Secretary

Lois Hager

Michael Johnson

Philip Schenck, Town Manager, Ex Officio

Roberta LaMonaca, Director of Library Services, Ex Officio

Charge: Seek a new facility for Prosser Public Library, either by renovating and expanding the current building or another alternative. The overriding objective of the project is to effectively, economically and responsibly maximize library space, to provide the most benefit, from a library services perspective, to the community of Bloomfield.

Planning Phase Objective: Define the scope and budget of the project in order to provide an efficient and effective facility capable of addressing the needs of a 21st century library.

This is the first of 3 proposed monthly reports by the Building Committee (BC) to the Town Council (TC): February 22, March 28, and April 25, 2016.

The BC held its formational meeting on Nov. 30, 2015. Following solicitation, interviews, and short listing by the Library Board of Directors, the BC interviewed the 2 recommended architectural firms and selected Tai Soo Kim Partners (TSKP) of Hartford on Jan 11, 2016. The BC has held 3 regular meetings since that time with TSKP. Members of the Library Board of Directors, Friends of the Library, and the public have attended the meetings; their opportunity to comment will continue throughout the Planning Phase. Together with TSKP, the BC has developed a comprehensive schedule for the Planning Phase. The next meeting of the BC is scheduled for Feb 29, 2016, followed by March 14, March 21, and April 11, understanding the potential need for other interim meetings. In addition to the regular BC meetings, the Planning Phase schedule includes the BC presenting at the March meetings of the Administration & Education TC Subcommittee, and the Land Use & Economic Development TC Subcommittee, and the April meeting of the Finance TC Subcommittee. A Public Focus Group meeting is planned for April 12 where the public will be invited to offer further comments on the project. Another project update will be presented to the TC at the March 28 meeting, and final recommendations to the TC will be made at the April 25, 2016 meeting, thus facilitating the TC to begin considerations at their May 9, 2016 meeting for funding and a potential future referendum.

Utilizing objective criteria such as Connecticut Public Libraries statistics and examples of successful "21st century" type of new and renovated library facilities, TSKP has been updating the scope of the Prosser Library's needs, and analyzing potential project sites. The previously commissioned reports by Tuthill & Wells Architects in 2011, the Weston and Sampson Engineers report on flood mitigation in 2013, the Goman & York Prosser Public Library Recommendations in 2015, and the Bloomfield Plan of Conservation and Development/ Bloomfield Center Plan are all important sources for consideration in defining and selecting options. As part of the space needs assessment, TSKP and the BC are reviewing the opportunities and practicality for Library programs to share existing space within other Town facilities, thus potentially reducing the project scope.

Potential project sites being investigated consist of:

- **The existing Prosser Library facility.** Multiple options are being considered including additions and renovations of varying configurations and orientations, flood mitigation options, and the necessity/potential of additional land acquisition.
- **Town Hall site.** Multiple options are being considered including the Library as an addition to Town Hall and varying configurations of the Library as a standalone building.
- **Wintonbury Mall site.** With the assistance of the Town's economic development consultant, Goman & York, the potential of a leased facility is under investigation.
- **330 Park Avenue.** In addition to the potential of shared space, the option for relocating Prosser Library in its entirety is under investigation in conjunction/cooperation with the 330 Park Avenue code update/needs assessment/utilization study currently being developed. For reference purposes, Milton Lewis Howard Associates conducted a study for the relocation of Prosser Library to 330 Park Avenue in 1993.

All planning is being conducted cognizant of the State Grant Program for Public Libraries; Notice of Intent deadline of June 30, 2016, and Application deadline of Sept. 1, 2016.

Ongoing consulting services from Goman & York, are also being utilized to assist in the understanding and analysis of overall economic development opportunities in relation to the Library project, and opportunities to dovetail with Bloomfield Town Center objectives.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Weisman, Chair
Prosser Library Alteration/Construction Building Committee



Farmington River Watershed Association, Inc.

749 Hopmeadow Street, Simsbury, CT 06070
(860) 658-4442 Fax (860) 651-7519 www.frwa.org

February 22, 2016

Comments to Bloomfield Town Council Regarding Niagara Water Bottling Plant

FRWA is not taking a position on the sale of water by MDC to a business customer in Bloomfield, but this should not be construed to mean that FRWA supports the details or the process of the deal struck with Niagara in Bloomfield.

FRWA opposes the secretive manner in which the negotiations between Niagara and both the MDC and the Town of Bloomfield were conducted. If decisions about an essential resource like a town's drinking water are not conducted transparently, the result is what we have now: elected officials and the water utility being accused of a breach of public trust. The MDC and town governments are frequently criticized by their constituents, whether they deserve it or not. That doesn't excuse them from making an effort to inform the people they serve, while there's still time for public debate.

FRWA opposes price breaks for large consumers of water, even for a company in the business of re-selling the water. The price breaks are inconsistent with pricing structures that encourage water conservation. Niagara's cost of purchasing MDC's water and sewer service should be comparable to that of other customers, and the cost should be passed along to their bottled water customers.

FRWA strongly advocates that questionable uses of our state's drinking water should be addressed in the state water plan that is now being developed. If, for example, the bottling and re-sale of our public water supply is not in the public interest, then we should seek to control it via town policy, new regulations, or new legislation.

Lastly, FRWA continues to advocate augmenting the flow to the East Branch of the Farmington River by releases from Barkhamsted Reservoir so as to better support aquatic life in the East Branch. This is especially true as long as the MDC states that it has a surplus of salable water in Barkhamsted Reservoir.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Eileen Fielding". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Eileen Fielding
Executive Director

I am Valerie Rossetti and I live at 88 Kenmore Rd in Bloomfield.

We **have** been in the middle of a perfect storm these past few months, and one that's caused a distrust between the town council and many of the citizens it represents. Tonight, I am submitting on behalf of a group of Bloomfield Citizens a 10 point plan to address some of the deficiencies of process and to point you once again to action you can still take to protect our water. Your action to address these issues may help restore trust. Your inaction will be remembered in Novembers to come.

10 Point BloomfieldCitizens.Org Plan to Protect Our Water and Our Democracy

1st - PROTECT OUR WATER: Tax abatement or no tax abatement, Bloomfield, is one of 8 MDC voting towns and has the right and responsibility to support wise and just use of our water. We must change MDC ordinances and state law so that no large industrial users are granted discounted water and sewer rates. Why should the town of Bloomfield, other town industries, and residents be paying more for water or sewer than Niagara? Why should we be conserving a natural resource while they are incentivized to use more? We must also support upcoming state legislation to prioritize our residents in case of a water supply shortage- no such regulation currently exists in the state drought plan- as even the MDC admits. And so we ask:

1. **Pass a resolution supporting the prioritization of Bloomfield residents in case of a water shortage.**
2. **Pass a resolution prohibiting the export of water out of state in case of water shortage.**
3. **Pass a resolution supporting the revocation of water and sewer discounts for large industrial users.**

2nd PROTECT DEMOCRACY AND TRANSPARENCY: Bloomfield citizens deserve timely and complete access to information as well as the opportunity for input on town decisions.

4. **Adopt town regulations to comply with legislation submitted by Rep. Baram requiring "Transparency in Applications for Zoning, Zoning Board of Appeals, Wetlands, and Tax Abatements"** (see attached draft). We know what happened with Niagara- a name deliberately left off wetlands and zoning permits to disguise the true nature of the development to come.

5. **Revise Wetlands Commissions and TPZ regulations to require applicants and administrative staff to provide Commissioners specific information regarding any environmental concerns of the planned development:** such as hazardous materials in production, storage, or emission; noise, light, or material pollution; traffic impacts; and consumption of natural resources. We know what happened with Niagara:

On Jan 13, 2016 we have the town wetlands agent writing to ask Ed Lally about the types of materials stored on the site and whether there are containment measures if they are hazardous. This is 2 months after the wetlands hearing in which none of these questions was asked, even though town officials knew Niagara's plans. At the TPZ hearing on Nov 19th, we have Mr. Lally stating that the company would be making its own bottles with "a small amount of plastic". No mention was made of millions of bottles/day

nor of the Niagara name. The town planner- quite familiar with the company- and present at the meeting, made no effort to correct that.

6. Require referral of any significant environmental town issue to the town's Conservation, Energy, and Environment Committee for an advisory opinion. On Dec 22nd members of the CEEC- before any contract had been signed by anyone-requested you slow down the process and examine the environmental issues at stake, a suggestion that was ignored.

7. Enact a Moratorium on tax abatements until the town council adopts criteria for their evaluation; including a true cost-benefit analysis and an independent review of the applicant's business practices and fiscal health.

8. Revise the town charter to require a Public Hearing at least 2 weeks prior to any vote by the council on a tax abatement.

9. Eliminate Conflict-of-Interests: insist town officials, including the town attorney, excuse themselves from participation in decision-making or the provision of legal services in any matter in which they have a conflict-of-interest.

10. Enforce the publication of all agenda at least 24 hours prior to the meeting; notices of any special meeting should be placed on town website 24 hours prior to meeting; minutes to be available within 7 48 hours if any vote was taken or within 7 days. It is strongly recommended that publication include placement on the town's website.

Your action to address these issues may help restore trust. Your inaction will be remembered in Novembers to come.

10 Point BloomfieldCitizens.Org Plan to Protect Our Water and Our Democracy

PROTECT OUR WATER: Bloomfield, as one of 8 MDC voting towns, has the right and responsibility to support wise and just use of our water. We must change MDC ordinances and state law so that no large industrial users are granted discounted water and sewer rates. We must support upcoming state legislation to prioritize our residents in case of a water supply shortage.

1. Pass a resolution supporting the prioritization of Bloomfield residents in case of a water shortage.
2. Pass a resolution prohibiting the export of water out of state in case of water shortage.
3. Pass a resolution supporting the revocation of water and sewer discounts for large industrial users.

PROTECT DEMOCRACY AND TRANSPARENCY: Bloomfield citizens deserve timely and complete access to information as well as the opportunity for input on town decisions.

4. Adopt town regulations to comply with legislation submitted by Rep. Baram requiring "Transparency in Applications for Zoning, Zoning Board of Appeals, Wetlands, and Tax Abatements" (see attached draft).
5. Revise Wetlands Commissions and TPZ regulations to require applicants and administrative staff to provide Commissioners specific information regarding any environmental concerns of the planned development: such as hazardous materials in production, storage, or emission; noise, light, or material pollution; traffic impacts; and consumption of natural resources.
6. Require referral of any significant environmental town issue to the town's Conservation, Energy, and Environment Committee for an advisory opinion.
7. Enact a Moratorium on tax abatements until the town council adopts criteria for their evaluation; including a true cost-benefit analysis and an independent review of the applicant's business practices and fiscal health.
8. Revise the town charter to require a Public Hearing at least 2 weeks prior to any vote by the council on a tax abatement.
9. Eliminate Conflict-of-Interests: insist town officials excuse themselves from participation in decision-making or the provision of legal services in any matter in which they have a conflict-of-interest.
10. Enforce the publication of all agenda at least 24 hours prior to meeting; notices of any special meeting to be placed on town website 24 hours prior to meeting; minutes to be available within 7 days or by 48 hours if any vote was taken. It is strongly recommended that publication include placement on the town's website.

REQUEST AND EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

To Judiciary Chairs:

1. To require an Application for local land use permit or tax abatement, before the Town Council, Board of Selectmen, or Mayor, the Planning & Zoning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals, or the Inland-Wetlands Commission, to provide information deemed necessary by the locality, which must include the following:

a. The name, address, web site if any, and telephone number of any developers of the property, with a brief statement describing the specific purpose of development;

b. The relationship of the person signing the Application to the land owner, applicant, and to the developer, together with the nature of the authority upon which the person executing the Application has relied;

c. The contractual relationship of the Applicant to any developer with whom the Applicant or land owner has contracted with on or before the Application is filed, which shall include the information set forth in subparagraph (a) above. The Application shall be updated at any time through the date of final action by the permitting board, if a developer or new developer enters into a contractual relationship with the land owner or the Applicant, and shall provide the information set forth in subparagraph (a) above;

For purposes of this statute, applicant and land owner shall include a business entity, partnership, joint venture, or any other contractual relationship with a developer who plans to develop the property independent of the applicant or land owner, or in some relationship to the applicant or land owner.

Any Public Notice of an application before the local permitting body, shall contain a brief statement identifying the purpose of the development.

From Representative David Baram

Mark Saunders - 13 Pent Road

Over a year ago, on Feb. 18, Becky Nolan with the MetroHartford Alliance sent an email marked CONFIDENTIAL. It stated that Niagara was buckling from challenges in NY.

One challenge was "Public opposition to the use of a public commodity for a private company's profit." It also stated Niagara's need for additional spring water resources to reconsider CT so "if anyone has any information for a spring water source PLEASE let me know ASAP."

Mayor Gamble, you responded to the email on the same day, suggesting several Bloomfield locations.

So, Let's be clear about something once and for all. At least a year ago you knew, without question, that public opposition would be a determining issue with Niagara coming to Bloomfield. Upon becoming mayor, you chose to withhold and continued to mask information about them coming, for whatever reason.

But can we at least agree now that this was not an open process?
(long pause)

That is not a rhetorical question. Can we agree this was not a completely open process?
(longer pause)

So I'll continue. The first time Bloomfield residents could express their feelings about this in public was Jan 11th. The email you circulated before that meeting on the 10th states "At the Council meeting we will allow members of the public to speak on the issue. My recommendation is that we thank them for their attendance but, make no changes to our vote."

That explains why I felt so unheard after speaking at that meeting, and, I imagine, how I will feel about tonight when my head hits the pillow.

There is so much at stake here, so it is troubling that you appear to think of residents with honest concerns as adversaries, or as you put it, a cancer. Whether or not you agree with us, to decide, as the mayor,

not to honestly listen to us, shows me that you don't fully understand your duty as Mayor.

A Jan. 11th e-mail from Todd Uhlick, Associate Counsel at Niagara, to you, from his **personal** email account, stated, "I know Katie and Dereith are working closely with you and others to ensure we don't have any surprises, but I wanted to say hello, and let me know if there's something you need to help quell the opposition." Your response was to thank him for his "kind words." What of your obligation to make sure your constituents don't have any surprises?

Knowing that the MDC "jumped through hoops to accommodate and attract Niagara," it is also troubling that the town attorney continued to operate in an advisory capacity during this whole process as he lists The MDC as a former client. It is troubling that the town council was fine with this obvious conflict of interest.

Two days before the council meeting, he writes to you on Jan 9th, "...it is important to keep in mind that the Council has already approved an agreement with Niagara. Any action that conflicts or restricts your prior vote would be problematic."

Mr Needelman continued to fabricate a contractual exposure well before any finalized contract was in place.

At the public meeting on the 11th, he clearly stated, "There was no specific date by your resolution that the agreement had to be executed by." So as I said that evening, a two week postponement had no legal consequences for the town. Yet, after a proper motion to postpone the abatement was made and seconded, it was overruled.

Eleven days later, on Jan 22nd, just three days before the next town meeting, the contract was delivered to Niagara. That same day, they formally declined your invitation to appear for us. Thanks to the way this was handled, you eliminated their only reason to come.

So I ask one last time, was this a completely open process?
(wait until they call time)

Town Council Meeting - Public Comment
February 21, 2016

My name is Paula Jones. I've lived at 5 Bear Ridge Drive in Bloomfield for 23 years. I've always done my best to pay attention to what's happening in Town, to vote, to participate in public input forums such as those offered for the Plan of Conservation and Development, and to contribute to Bloomfield's improvement through volunteer work. I've thought that my elected officials value my participation and opinions, even if I don't always agree with them. So I expected the entire Council to pause and reconsider the Niagara tax abatement when a large group of citizens respectfully asked them to do so last month.

Well, my expectations have certainly been re-set in the past two months. I've been reading Town e-mails regarding the Niagara project that were obtained through a Freedom of Information Act request. The e-mails show the Town cooperated with Niagara from the onset to keep the proposal quiet. And recent e-mails show a flurry of Town activity to finalize the tax abatement contract after citizens found out about it.

I am going to read portions of one e-mail sent early in the process – it's dated February 18, 2015. To me, it shows another angle as to why Bloomfield officials would offer a \$4.9 million tax abatement. It also sheds insight into why the MDC would pass special ordinances that would discount water and sewer rates that only Niagara qualifies for.

The e-mail is from Rebecca Nolan, Vice President, Business Development, of Metro Hartford Alliance. Art Ross is mentioned – he's Niagara's real estate broker. The Subject line reads: "CONFIDENTIAL – Niagara Bottling – Update"

I quote:

"Hello Team CT!

I just spoke with Art Ross who has informed me the Niagara Bottling Project may have life again in Connecticut!

There have been some challenges to the location in Ulster NY and the Niagara Bottling Team (NB Team) has "pulled the plug" on the project, making the alternative Bloomfield site back on a short list!

What we know:

- There was local opposition to the project in NY over the use of water drawn from the city's reservoir. There was public opposition to the use of a public commodity for a private company's profit. Among other issues...;
- The NB team originally received a warm welcome and a community was willing to work with them;
- The NB Team chose not to come to CT because of the lack of spring water resources. To bring the necessary water, it would have to add millions of dollars annually to a CT location, however now they are reconsidering;
- There is still a need to open a northeast location; and,
- The NB Team wants a "Shovel Ready" site (the alternative Bloomfield site is zones industrial with a site plan approved already in place).

What needs to happen:

- The NB Team will look for additional spring water resources (**if anyone has any information for a spring water source PLEASE let me know ASAP**)
- A specific timeframe has not been established, however it is likely they could be in construction late 2015, early '16, and open by early 2017.
- The NB Team may have a "cooling down" period (approximately 60 days +/-) before they will come back to discussions on CT.

Therefore....once I have more specifics, you will receive an e-mail from me, so until then....keep your fingers crossed and be ready to rally!

Best regards,
Becky"

Niagara's spring water cost problem caught my eye. Because of this additional cost, the numbers didn't work for a CT location.

Before I saw Ms. Nolan's e-mail, I had seen a comparison of Bloomfield's tax abatement offer to incentives offered Niagara by 4 other towns.

I've included a summary for those 4 towns – Mooresville, NC, Aurora, CO, Gahanna, OH, and Seguin, TX. Anyone can look this up online. The info was gathered from local business and news articles in each location. It's what was presented to average citizens like me. Of course, any non-publicized agreements aren't included.

Bloomfield is offered 38 jobs, with the potential to increase to 75 after 2 years. Bloomfield is offering \$4.9 Million in tax abatements over 7 years.

City	Jobs Offered & Investment	Known inducements received (\$ or %)	Comparison to Bloomfield deal
Mooresville, NC (Greater Charlotte)	66 at an average wage of \$40,000; \$45 Million in Investment	\$200,000 grant from State	28 MORE jobs; \$4.7 million LESS in giveaways
Aurora, CO (Denver area)	38 jobs at average wage of \$45,000 to \$50,000; \$30 Million Plant	\$114,000 from 3 entities noted in statement above	Same number of jobs in first phase; \$4.8 Million LESS in giveaways
Gahanna, OH (Columbus area)	73 jobs	60% State tax credit for 7 years; 50% tax credit for 5 years (\$ amounts not reported)	35 MORE jobs initially; LOWER percentage - tax credits
Seguin, TX (San Antonio area)	75 jobs; \$85 Million in Investment	\$1,470,900 from 2 entities as noted in statement above	37 MORE jobs initially; \$3.4 Million LESS in giveaways

Quoting again from Rebecca Nolan's Confidential February 18, 2015 e-mail:

- The NB Team chose not to come to CT because of the lack of spring water resources. To bring the necessary water, it would have to add millions of dollars annually to a CT location, however now they are reconsidering;

The numbers didn't work in CT. So the "Free Market" went to work. The Town of Bloomfield and the MDC threw money at Niagara. They fixed Niagara's problem by shifting company costs onto the backs of Bloomfield taxpayers and MDC ratepayers. "We the people" are subsidizing Niagara's higher costs in CT to bring in spring water. Is Corporate Welfare what passes for "Economic Development" in Bloomfield?

Bloomfield Town Council
February 22, 2016

Statement by Lori Brown, 3 Scott Drive, Bloomfield, CT 06002

Managing a public trust resource such as water in a way that undercuts what is good for the public goes way beyond the boundaries of this town. Unfortunately, Bloomfield is now at the epicenter of an enormous controversy that is attracting the attention of other MDC-served towns, state agencies, statewide organizations and concerned citizens from all across Connecticut. This issue is far from over.

In fact, Bloomfield is quickly becoming the statewide poster child of how NOT to manage our state's water supply. Your actions have prompted several legislative initiatives now raised at the Connecticut General Assembly to make sure the tactics and loopholes used by Niagara when you worked out this deal cannot be used so easily going forward.

The remedies we are seeking at the state legislature will:

- **Outlaw discounts for high volume users such as Niagara, AND eliminate discounts for their disposal of waste water**
- **Require the same cutbacks for a company bottling our water for resale as for residents in times of drought**
- **Add a surcharge for use of infrastructure**
- **Require complete transparency on all levels of decision making on water policy**

The Bloomfield Town Council was sold a bill of goods by a huge, national corporation that is well versed in how to manipulate the system at both the town and state level in order to get around the public for their own benefit.

When I attended the most recent meeting of the town's Economic Development Committee, I asked what information the committee used to decide that this was a good deal for Bloomfield's economic benefit.

Based on their reaction to that question, I believe there wasn't any serious consideration of facts in their decision-making process.

Whether or not the Town Council believes this is a "done deal," I believe you owe it to the citizens to conduct a cost/benefit analysis of this project to the town that includes the long-term costs of traffic, sewage, emissions, services, maintenance, and local job growth.

I would also like to include with my testimony a statement by the Farmington River Watershed Association. While they cannot take a position on the sale of water by the MDC to a business in Bloomfield, they note that it should not be construed to mean that FRWA supports the details or the process of the deal struck with Niagara. Their full statement is attached.

This mess, and the resulting costly battle that is now playing out, are what await other towns across Connecticut and the nation if it goes unchecked here in Bloomfield. The citizens of this town, along with a growing number of affected MDC-served towns and statewide groups concerned with responsible water management, are going to keep putting a bright light on this problem. Thank you.

Niagara Bottling
3 years at 100%, 2 years at 85%, 1 year at 80%, 1 year at 50%
Current Mill rate = 36 mills - Assume a 2% yearly increase

Niagara Bottling
3 years at 100%, 2 years at 85%, 1 year at 80%, 1 year at 50%
Current Mill rate = 36 mills - Assume a 2% yearly increase

[illegible]

Total Value	\$32,385,500	Not clear why the value changed when there was no change in the inputs (i.e. sq ft and value for sq ft)
Total Assessment (70%)	\$22,669,850	

Assessment Before Abatement	\$22,669,850	\$1,000,000	\$23,669,850
Real Estate Personal Property (Est)			

Phase I	RE Taxes	New PP Taxes	Bldg Permits	Total
	\$816,115	\$36,000	\$450,000	\$1,302,115
	0.03600	Inconsequential v. 1 mill		

Yr	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Inflation Rate		2.0%						
Estimated Mill Rate		0.03672	0.03745	0.03818	0.03891	0.03965	0.04038	0.04135
Percent Estimated Taxes Before Abatement		100%	100%	100%	95%	85%	50%	50%
Abated Tax Amount		\$771,120	\$795,650	\$820,176	\$844,702	\$936,571	\$681,103	\$434,203
Fixed Assessment		\$1,958,850	\$1,958,850	\$1,958,850	\$1,958,850	\$4,919,850	\$5,869,850	\$12,169,850

**Total 7 year
(Town's v2 Benefit Analysis)**

Total 7 year	\$5,188,572	\$4,680,295
(Town's v2 Benefit Analysis)	\$6,171,413	\$4,907,154

Year Total		(\$25,000)	(\$50,000)	(\$75,000)	(\$100,000)
10%	\$74,473	\$718,713	\$864,713	\$669,713	
20%	\$50,981	(\$55,991)	(\$110,991)	(\$135,991)	
30%	(\$265,695)	(\$391,695)	(\$391,695)	(\$394,695)	
40%	(\$1,672,369)	(\$1,697,369)	(\$1,722,369)	(\$1,747,369)	
50%	\$2,478,102	\$2,593,102	\$2,528,102	(\$2,553,102)	(\$2,553,102)

NPV @ 5% Upfront Costs

	(\$25,000)	(\$50,000)	(\$75,000)	(\$100,000)
10%	\$621,067	\$996,082	\$717,107	\$946,067
20%	(\$42,382)	(\$67,382)	(\$92,382)	(\$117,382)
30%	(\$705,830)	(\$730,830)	(\$755,830)	(\$780,830)
40%	(\$1,368,279)	(\$1,394,279)	(\$1,419,279)	(\$1,444,279)
50%	(\$2,032,727)	(\$2,057,727)	(\$2,082,727)	(\$2,107,727)

Where are the costs? Isn't a CBA supposed to be an analysis of whether the benefits outweigh the costs?

Existing property taxes on the land should be removed from cost benefit - the Town would get those regardless

This is driving the NPV computation - Is the Town's goal bureaucratic rent capture?

NPV @ 5% (\$67,382)

[illegible]

Total Municipal Expenditures - FY 2015-16 Budget

% Allocated to Commercial/Industrial Users	20%
Commercial/Industrial Budget	\$7,282,970
Assessed Value of New Enterprise	\$21,000,000
Value of Existing Nonresidential Development	\$705,604,809
Allocation of Commercial/Industrial Budget	3.0%
Annual Cost before Inflation	\$716,754

Niagara Bottling CBA - revised Town Inputs

CBA

2/8/2016

I'm Kevin Gough, 5 Bear Ridge Drive here in Bloomfield. At the last Council meeting I spoke about the meager amount of financial analysis I'd seen – and evidently that had been done – on the Niagara tax abatement. Tonight I'm here again – the Town has updated its numbers and so have I.

Before we review the analysis and its conclusions, I apologize in advance to the audience and viewers at home: since this is quantitative information, we can't easily project spreadsheets, and I'm given limited time, some of this may be hard to follow. We do plan on posting my work on Bloomfield Citizens facebook page.

I was copied on e-mail correspondence with the Council giving an updated calculation of abated and received taxes and building permit fees for Niagara. From this correspondence:

- No one has done an in-depth financial analysis of the Niagara Bottling proposal. All documents from Bloomfield – prepared either by a consultant (Goman + York) or Town Staff – are summaries of the amount of taxes abated/collected from the project; **none include offsetting costs.** [A 1/26/16 e-mail from the Town Planner states this: “As you can see from our spreadsheet *this was never intended to be a cost/benefit analysis* [emphasis added] – just an analysis of tax revenue.”]
- As noted in my 1/25/16 comments to the Council, apart from the depth of the analysis, the Town's spreadsheet contained various errors. Mr. Giner was asked to “fix” these on 1/26/16. He subsequently sent a new spreadsheet to Goman + York and Manager Schenck, which was passed to the Council. [I have not included this in your packets as you were all copied.]
- The new spreadsheet a) still contains errors (though smaller: the first year mill rate is inconsistent and the stated assumptions that don't match the building valuation), b) contains “updated” assumptions regarding the deal, particularly the value of the building, and c) still doesn't include a cost component, per Mr. Giner's note.
- The new assumptions are:
 - A third lot, left out of the original analysis, raising the land valuation by ≈\$700 K;
 - Valuation of the building increased from \$26 MM to \$30 MM, although there is no explanation for this – the spreadsheet still states a 443,000 sq. ft. building at \$60 per sq. ft.; and
 - Previous year 1 mill rate of 0.036 is adjusted up 2% to the former year 2 mill rate of 0.03672, although as noted before this change is inconsistent within the spreadsheet, which is still using 0.036 in calculating some of the input numbers.

- Per its analysis, the Town now proposes a **\$4.9 million dollar abatement benefit for Niagara, 20% more than originally publicized.**

After looking at these changes, I also adjusted my cost benefit analysis (CBA), specifically the revenue (“benefit”) calculation. In the first pass from 1/25, given the short time I had to review the spreadsheet, I simply used the Town’s revenue number. Looking at the assumption changes, I realized that the tax on the land itself, though included in the Town’s revenue, is not new revenue – those taxes would be paid regardless of what structure goes on the land. Accordingly, they should be removed from the CBA. (I also removed the land from my unit cost analysis.)

As noted 1/25, I have no Town published cost studies to rely on to get unit cost assumptions. I used a proportional valuation method based on Bloomfield’s Grand List and FY Budget to estimate ongoing taxpayer costs of the factory and an estimate for start-up costs. As these were broad estimates, I used sensitivity analysis over a wide range for the assumptions. I calculated the net benefit after cost 7 years out as well as the net present value (NPV) at a hurdle rate of 5%.


Results:

- **Under all scenarios except that where the portion of the Town Municipal (non-educational) Budget allocated to commercial/industrial enterprises is under 20% of the total, costs of the tax abatement exceed revenues from Niagara. This is a money-loser for taxpayers.** (I used a \$36.4 million non-educational budget; 20% means about \$7.3 million allocated to commercial/industrial enterprises.)
- **In the one scenario with positive outcomes, value to the Town is nearly equal to (and driven by) the up-front \$450,000 Building Permit for the project!**

So, under the revised (“better”) assumptions, the tax abatement has increased and so has likely loss to the citizens. This will lead to higher taxes for residents (not to mention the higher water rates and sewage rates from the MDC’s sweetheart deals with Niagara). The financial review done by the Town to date is neither a complete nor a fiscally responsible analysis of the Niagara proposal.

My name is Sharon Mann. I live at 1 Adams Road. I've contributed my time to this town for 47 years in various volunteer roles and was selected by The Lion's Club in 1999. as Citizen of the Year I am not happy to see how our mayor and town council are insulting an active, intelligent group of citizens who have demonstrated their continuous commitment to making Bloomfield better. HOW CAN YOU JUSTIFY SUCH ARROGANT BEHAVIOR and YOU WONDER WHY AS CITIZENS WE ARE SO UPSET

Under the Freedom of Information Act, BloomfieldCitizens.org was able to determine some of the following details.

Feb/Mar 2014 Niagara expresses interest in a Connecticut location. The town pays to put Niagara reps up at Linden House in **Simsbury**. Griffin Land declines a deal with Niagara saying it would have a devaluing effect on their remaining lands, that of our neighbors, and potentially harming our good will within the Bloomfield and Windsor communities. The Sponzo site on Woodland Avenue becomes the potential site in April 2014. 

On Feb 18, 2015, Becky Nolan (Metro Hartford Alliance) notes that there have been some challenges to Niagara in Ulster County (NY), particularly citizen opposition to the use of a public commodity for a private company's profit.

Nov 16, 2015 before Council's Finance Subcommittee is scheduled to discuss the tax abatement, Niagara's development specialist, Katie Booher asks if the company's name will be mentioned. If so, she says, we may need to pull it from the agenda, we are not ready for that(the name Niagara) to be public.

On December 2, 2015 e-mail from Town Manager to Town Planner noting that he'd forwarded the comments of the Finance Director, Bill Hogan, who found the Niagara financial analysis "weak".

On December 15, 2015, the project surfaces publically in the Hartford Courant report on Councils approval of the tax abatement agreement the previous night. **For the first time the name Niagara is identified.** Neither the town's Wetlands Commission nor its TPZ had the benefit of that information. On December 20th Mayor Gamble, council members and the Town Manager receive an email from Rebecca Martin of the Kingston citizens' organization in Kingston, NY. Ms Martin had learned of the Bloomfield Niagara deal and wrote offering to share information from their most recent experience dealing with Niagara. The mayor followed up with a note to council members that she was very suspect of Ms Martin's email and dismissed it rather than taking it seriously. The December 28th Council meeting is postponed for reasons unknown.

On January 9, 2016 Mayor Gamble receives an email from the Town Attorney that says, " I understand that some folks may be attending Monday's meeting to warn of dangers of a bottling plant. While they may be vocal and even persuasive, it is important to keep in mind that the Council has already approved the agreement with Niagara, and I'm sure they have acted in reliance of your action. Any action that conflicts with your prior vote